DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 669 EA 005 482

AUTHOR	Mortimore, David E.; And Others
TITLE	The Emergence and Development of a Radically Innovative Junior High School Program.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Salem.
REPORT NO	Vol 27 No 319
PUB DATE	Oct 73
NOTE	42p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Oregon Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, P.O. Box 421, Salem, Oregon 97308 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Educational Environment; Educational Experiments; *Educational Innovation; Instructional Improvement; *Junior High Schools; Language Arts; Nongraded System; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Program Planning; School Registration; *Student Participation; Ungraded Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Eugene; House Organization; Oregon; *Roosevelt Junior High School

ABSTRACT

In September, 1969, a radically innovative program for middle school children was undertaken at Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School, one of eight junior high schools in School District 4J, Eugene, Oregon. Because the Roosevelt program is one that goes far beyond the usual idea of innovation, it is anticipated that this program description will be useful in providing incentives for educators to pursue new concepts in curriculum construction and program planning. This analysis was limited to the initial three years of the program development and to its first year of operation, 1969-1970. First, some background information about the program is presented. Then, the authors discuss the development of the program--detailing both the formal and informal actions which led to the program inception--and describe the initial summer workshop. The presentation next covers the implementation of the program, the first year of operation, problems encountered and solutions formulated, and analyses of actual student choices. Following these analyses are an evaluation of the first year, some conclusions reached in the second workshop, examples of student and parent reactions, and a discussion of the direction for the second year. A summary and an overview of the program after the first year conclude the publication. A short bibliography is included. (Author/EA)

ED 083669

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Oregon ASCD *Curriculum Bulletin*

THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT
OF A RADICALLY INNOVATIVE
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

No. 319
XXVII
October 1973
Price $1.50

Prepared by:

David E. Mortimere
Thomas H. Roberts
Donald M. Jackson

Harold Stauffer, Special Editor
Associate Professor, Univ. of Portland
Portland, Oregon

Published by:

Oregon Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development
P.O.Box 421
Salem, Oregon 97308

EA 005 482

General Editor:
Hugh B. Wood
Manuscript Editor:
Charles Gengler
Associate Editors:
Jule Crume
Charline Edwards
Chester Frisbie
Rose Marie Service

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF A RADICALLY INNOVATIVE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

David E. Mortimore D.Ed., Thomas H. Roberts D.Ed.
and Donald M. Jackson

Table of Contents

page

INTRODUCTION 1

Overview
Philosophical Premises Underlying the Program
A Brief History of Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School
The Participating Staff
An Analysis of the Climate Which Fostered Radical Innovation

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM 6

The Language Arts and Social Studies No-Grade Experiment
The Language Arts Free-Choice Experiment
The Meadowbrook Visitation
The Initial Workshop

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM 13

Problems of Registration
Problems of Class Imbalance
Problems of House
Student Evaluation
An Analysis of Actual Student Choice

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST YEAR 19

The Second Workshop
The Evaluation Procedure
House Organization and Policies
The Role of the House Advisor
The Role of Parents
Student Reaction to the Program
Parent Reaction to the Program

CONCLUSIONS 24

Conclusions
Epilogue

APPENDICES 29

BIBLIOGRAPHY 39

List of Tables

Table page

I. A Comparison of Course Units Selected In a Free Curriculum With Those In a Required, Traditional Curriculum. .18

II. Distribution of Course Areas Selected by Students 19

INTRODUCTION

In September, 1969, a radically innovative program for middle school children was undertaken at Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School, one of eight junior high schools in School District 4J, Eugene, Oregon. An article in the Eugene Register-Guard described the program as follows:

> The similarities between Roosevelt Junior High School and Eugene's seven other junior highs are numerous; but the differences are more important.
>
> These differences make Roosevelt's "experimental" three-year program probably unique in the nation.
>
> What's it all about?
>
> Principal David Mortimore avoids the word "relaxed" when speaking of the school's new approach. But he agrees with Roosevelt teacher Charles Mullaley that students "ought to learn how to make some pretty important decisions at an early age."
>
> As a result, when Roosevelt's 800 students showed up for classes this fall they found a university-type curriculum waiting for them. Among the changes were that they:
>
> --made their own decisions as to what courses they would register for;
> --had an expanded course list from which to choose;
> --learned they won't be getting 'letter grades' when their report cards are passed out in November;
> --will no longer be identified by class level in their courses.[1]

Never in the history of education has there been such a demand and need for revision in curricula and program organization in the public schools.[2] Although there have been many innovations in junior

---

[1]James Sellers, "School Beginning Unique Program," Eugene Register-Guard, September 14, 1969, sec. B, p. 9.

[2]Robert Goldhammer, Clinical Supervision (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), pp. 3-11.

high school curricula since its inception, there have not been major, basic changes in the structure of the junior high program except for the use of the modular schedule in a few junior high schools. The present junior high school is modeled after the senior high school and both schools essentially follow a program established near their inceptions for the primary purpose of preparing students for college entrance.[3]

The Roosevelt program is one which goes far beyond the usual idea of innovation. It is anticipated that the program description will be useful in providing incentive for educators to pursue a new concept in curriculum construction and program planning.

Overview

This analysis was limited to the initial three years of development of the Program and its first year of operation, 1969-1970. The first part is a presentation of background information about the Program. The second part discusses the development of the Program--both the formal and informal actions which led toward the program, and a description of the initial summer workshop. The third part presents the implementation of the program, the first year of operation, problems and solutions, and analyses of actual student choice. The fourth part is an evaluation of the first year, conclusions reached in the second workshop, student and parent reactions, and direction for the second year. A summary and an overview of the program after the first year is presented in the last part.

Philosophical Premises Underlying the Program

Very early in the planning of the Program, specific postulates were developed by the leaders of the staff. These postulates were that:

1. Basic to the junior high school program is the philosophical premise that the middle school provides broad opportunities for exploration. A close examination of the then-current program showed little evidence that students really had a chance to explore. Rather, they were locked into a program which was almost totally prescribed. It became encumbent upon the staff that students ought to <u>really</u> have a chance to explore.
2. If students were given a wide choice of subjects, they would tend to select courses which would reflect a balanced program. Parental concern for "solid" subjects was anticipated. The staff, after careful consideration of the issue took the position that "free choice" did not preclude traditional courses but in fact broadened the probabilities of enriching the students' experience either in place of, or in addition to, those offerings characteristic of other curricula.
3. If students had more choice in their school programs, they would be more interested in school as an educational enterprise. Absenteeism and general lack of interest in school were in-

---

[3]Nelson L. Bossing and Roscoe V. Cramer, <u>The Junior High School</u> (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), pp. 10-12.

creasing in rather alarming proportions.

4. If teachers had more choice of what they could teach, they would be more enthusiastic toward the teaching process. A typical characteristic of the traditional junior high program is the hiring of teachers to teach both language arts and social studies, a practice which commonly resulted in teachers teaching subjects for which they were ill-prepared, uninterested, or both.
5. Without the involvement of parents together with the children and the staff, the program would be severely handicapped. This position required the staff to seek ways which would facilitate this end.
6. Students must have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for their own education. The staff recognized that, more than any other problem facing them, was the necessity for the creation of a program wherein teachers and administration did not assume virtually the total responsibility for students' educations, thereby making them intellectual cripples and disinterested observers.

A Brief History of Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School

During that period between 1922 and 1938--when the junior high movement experienced its greatest growth--the Eugene School District Board and its superintendent, David John Jones, established two junior high schools on opposite sides of the town. Woodrow Wilson Junior High School was located on the west side, and Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School on the east. Records are not entirely clear as to the exact time, but apparently Roosevelt opened its doors to students for the first time in the fall of 1925.[4] The original building was located at 18th and Agate Streets, adjacent to the campus of the University of Oregon, the present location of Condon Elementary School.

In 1934, when more accurate records were kept, Wendell Van Loan came as principal, and the school had an enrollment of 350 students with 13 teachers. Enrollment grew gradually, fluctuating as the district opened other junior high schools after World War II. In 1969-70 approximately 750 students were attending.

Written records of the school's curriculum are not available except for recent years, but interviews with people who were connected with the school during those early years show that the curriculum was typical of those programs of the period described by Bossing and Cramer,[5] Gruhn and Douglass,[6] and others. During the 1950's, under the leadership of George B. Nelson, who had become the principal in 1943, the school curriculum was academically oriented, with major emphasis placed on grouping for all academic subjects. Within the structure of the traditional seven-period day, grouping in academic subjects had the effect of grouping all classes. Under

---

[4]District 4J Board of Directors, Annual Report, 1959 (Eugene: District 4J Board of Directors, 1959), pp. 98-99.

[5]Bossing and Cramer, op. cit.

[6]William T. Gruhn and Harl R. Douglass, The Modern Junior High School (New York: The Ronald Press Company, rev. ed., 1956).

the evaluative criteria for the late 1950's, the Oregon State Department of Education called Roosevelt Junior High School "one of the best in the state."[7]

In 1960, one of the writers was assigned as assistant principal at Roosevelt, and five years later became principal. Times were changing significantly and there were numerous and significant staff changes. The assistant principal was bringing together staff members who were constantly raising questions about the changing needs of middle school children. Among these staff members were leaders who were willing to make changes, and an atmosphere was developing which would foster radical innovation.

The Participating Staff

Because Roosevelt Junior High School had been in operation as an institution for 44 years at the inception of the Program, one might expect to find a staff representative of long-term service. This did not prove to be the case. In the fall of 1969, there were 45 full-time staff members and three part-time; the senior staff member had been at Roosevelt for 26 years. It is interesting to note that she was one of the leaders in the new Program. Six staff members had been at Roosevelt for ten years or more; 27 had been there three years or less. The average for the entire staff was five years of service at Roosevelt, and six staff members had had no previous teaching experience.

The year before the Program began, a long-standing practice in the school was abandoned. Prior to the 1968-1969 school year, new teachers had been interviewed and hired entirely at the discretion of the principal. Recognizing that this procedure was not adequate for a program which would ultimately demand such close cooperation among teachers, the talents of a group of teachers called the Steering Committee were employed. This committee interviewed all candidates for teaching positions and made the final selections. The principal served as a member of the committee, but the committee in no way restricted its actions because of his membership.

The Steering Committee was made up of those key staff members who had been involved in the early informal discussions dating back to the 1966-1967 school year. On that committee were the principal and his assistant, the counselor, and chairmen from the mathematics, science, industrial education, English, and social studies departments. A word needs to be said about a committee that appears to be so traditional in its composition. District 4J had not recognized department chairmen in the junior high schools until the school year 1968-1969. The Roosevelt Program was being developed during the same period. Building principals were given a free hand in determining how department chaimen were to be selected. Although the majority of other building principals had their departments select their own heads, the principal at Roosevelt selected his from among the informal group which had been active in planning the Roosevelt Program. While

---

[7]District 4J Board of Directors, Schools in Review (Eugene: District 4J Board of Directors, June, 1958), p. 2.

his action would seem to many to be arbitrary, subsequent success of the Program--and an analysis of leadership in the first year of the Program--would show that those persons who served as the first Steering Committee were, indeed, leaders of innovation and leaders of the Program, and were respected by the rest of the staff as such.

It is interesting to note here that at the end of the first year of the Roosevelt Program, only one teacher voluntarily left the staff, and this was because she felt that at her age she did not have the strength that was necessary for so strenuous a teaching position as the Roosevelt Program demanded.

An Analysis of the Climate Which Fostered Radical Innovation

Examination of the developmental history of the staff at Roosevelt does not yield any real evidence as to why such a radically innovative program would develop there, and there is little evidence in the history of the school which would lead one to believe that innovation would develop at Roosevelt any more swiftly than at any other junior high school. It became necessary, therefore, to look elsewhere for possible understanding.

In November of 1970, Roosevelt staff members who had been involved with the original year of the Program were asked, "Why did so radical a program for junior high school students develop at Roosevelt and not at some other school?" Thirty-five percent of the staff responded. The responses have been categorized as follows:

* The administration encouraged teachers to explore all avenues, delegated authority, and created a climate for change.
* Some departments were questioning, to the point of exasperation, the practice of scheduling huge classes whose makeup was determined solely because they had to be scheduled back-to-back with other one-semester classes.
* There were groups of staff members who knew how to work together.
* The staff recognized that the traditional program was not providing the kind of education needed in today's world.
* There were two or three staff members who prodded and provoked many to think, argue, and finally to question their own premises concerning children and education.
* The staff became increasingly aware of the unrest among students.
* The staff could sense the importance of possibilities of some new kind of program.
* School District 4J gave encouragement for experimentation towards individualized programs and specific instructional objectives.
* Roosevelt's long tradition as a "maverick" school had attracted many teachers who would be compatible with notions of innovation.
* Teachers wanted to try a program where they would have only those students who wanted to be in their classes.
* Many teachers exhibited leadership toward change. To do this, it is assumed that they felt secure in their positions, knowing they were engaging in risks when developing any new program.
* The staff was very receptive to new approaches and was dedicated to try anything which might improve the educational program.
* There was a large number of aggressive younger faculty members.
* The administration carefully and persistently searched nationwide for new ideas, and brought these ideas to the staff.

The responses listed above were stated in several different ways. The one which was most often mentioned was the first, administrative encouragement for teachers to explore, and creation of an atmosphere which encouraged change.

The second most-often-mentioned reason for the development of the Program at Roosevelt was that the staff realized that the traditional pro-

gram was not providing the kind of education needed by young people in today's world. This is not to say that this group of people was unique in recognizing the inadequacy of today's educational programs for middle school children. Many teachers in many schools are recognizing that schools ought to change, and they undoubtedly have some challenging ideas which they would like to try, but all too often they believe they are prevented from doing so by the principal. As Fantini and Weinstein said:

> Ideally, therefore, the principal's role could be strategic . . . . in effecting basic reforms in educational practice . . . but they are more likely to be protectors of the status quo rather than reformers . . . public pressures upon the schools to produce better educational products will have little influence upon this machinery unless administrative reforms are forthcoming.[8]

MacConnell, Melby, and Arndt---writing as early as 1943 about The New School Program in Evanston, Illinois prior to the Second World War--stated the imperative need for democratic atmosphere very well when they wrote:

> Without realizing it we have developed in America a school system that is democratic in its purpose but authoritatian in its practices. The young sense it--at lease the intelligent do--but except for a few rebels they soon come to accept it just as their teachers did before them.
>
> We may teach <u>about</u> democracy in an authoritarian and autocratic school atmosphere, but we cannot teach democracy itself until we democratize our schools in concept, in purpose and organization and in the derivatives of its practical and philosophical idealogy.[9]

Based on what evidence we have, it can be assumed that most of the reasons given by the staff, in answer to the question of why so radical a program developed at Roosevelt, would be expressed as concerns by conscientious staff members in any junior high school. But the factors most commonly mentioned, that of the administration encouraging teachers to explore all avenues, sharing of authority, and creating a climate for change, appear to be paramount in permitting this program to develop at Roosevelt.

Research has shown that the administrative position is often the key to innovation. Brickell says:

> New types of instructional programs are introduced by administrators. Contrary to general opinion, teachers are not change agents for instructional innovations of major scope. Implication: To disseminate new types of instructional programs, it will be necessary to convince administrators of their value. . .
>
> Instructional changes which offer significant new ways of using professional talent, drawing upon instructional resources, allocating physical facilities, scheduling instructional time or altering physical space . . . depend almost exclusively upon administrative initiative . . .
>
> (The administrator) . . . may not be--and frequently is not--the original source of interest in a new type of program, but unless he gives it his attention and actively promotes its use, it will not come into being.[10]

While it is found that the teachers at Roosevelt did act as change agents in the development of the program, Brickell's research is significant in that it points toward the kind of administrative behavior which is necessary if there is to be innovation.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM

During the school years of 1966-1968, several

---

[8]Mario D. Fantini and Gerald Weinstein, <u>The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education</u> (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), pp. 197-198.

[9]Charles M. MacConnell, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt, <u>New Schools for a New Culture</u> (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1943), p. 201.

[10]Henry M. Brickell, <u>Organizing New York State for Educational Change</u> (Albany, New York: State Department of Education, 1961), pp. 22-24.

members of the Roosevelt staff engaged in informal discussions among themselves about changes which they believed they were noticing among students, especially in the attitudes of the students toward the traditional school program. These teachers were widely read, and had become aware of the growing body of literature which was highly critical of schools and curricula. Some of the discussion was initially directed toward helping staff members who were having severe problems with their classes. These teachers were highly traditional in their teaching and in some cases had been successful in an earlier day. Children had changed, however, even though it was felt by some that they had not. As the staff members who were to become the Program leaders became involved with these unsuccessful teachers, more and more attention was directed toward the problem of program irrelevance.

There was no organizational form for innovation during these years. Talks were generally between two, or among three or four, members of the staff. The principal was involved with the emerging leadership and gave constant encouragement to pursue any experiments which were felt might lead to meaningful change.

The nature of the discussion which took place during this two-year period resulted in the undertaking of two experiments--one in non-grading and one in free-choice, as well as a visit to Meadowbrook Junior High School at Newton Centre, Massachusetts, and an initial staff workshop.

The Language Arts and Social Studies No-Grade Experiment

The first experiment conducted at Roosevelt which had significant implications for the Program was one conducted during the 1967-1968 school year by three teachers who had groups of seventh graders for the combination language arts and social studies block-of-time. The experiment was built on the theory that if students coming into the middle school from the elementary school did not receive letter grades, they would not be so prone to do certain things because they thought they were necessary to receive good grades; they would take a more genuine interest in the learning process itself. Students came to Roosevelt from elementary schools where letter grades were not given. The teachers involved were very concerned about the trend among their students to work for grades rather than to learn because it was interesting or significant to do so.

The experiment lasted for one semester. Students were rated on a scale of 1, 2, and 3, but with extensive written evaluations, student-teacher conferences, and parent-teacher conferences. Unfortunately, the experiment was in no way conceptualized scientifically, and actual results from it are both intangible and insignificant in themselves. A student-and-parent questionnaire was given out at the end of the experiment, and favorable reactions were more prevalent than were unfavorable ones. The three teachers felt, subjectively, that they had seen evidences of behavioral change--that they had seen some students moving away from "playing the teacher's game" which grading often seemed to foster, toward more meaningful learning. While these results were unsubstantiated, two of the three teachers who were to become leaders in the development of the

Program felt that they had seen enough change in student behavior as to encourage them to carry experimentation further. The third teacher concurred with the first two, but because he transferred prior to the development of the Program, he obviously could not participate in the subsequent Program development.

The Language Arts Free-Choice Experiment

An experiment in giving students free choices of language arts courses was conducted during the last nine-week period of the school year 1968-1969, under the leadership of the three teachers who had tried non-grading the previous year. This experiment included three additional regular teachers and a cadet teacher. It provided for a series of short courses from which the student could make selections. The courses were intended to be introductory and were only two weeks in length, making it possible for the student to sign up for four consecutive language arts courses in the last quarter of school. The student retained the same teacher he had previously for social studies but had several of the participating teachers for language arts, depending on the courses for which he registered.

The rationale developed for this experimental program involved two basic ideas:

1. An elective program provided the student and his parents the opportunity to make decisions in selecting courses based on individual need and interest.
2. The program capitalized upon the specialized interests and preparation of the teachers involved and gave the student a greater variety of possible topics for study.

Both students and parents were urged to examine the course offerings before registration took place, and all avenues were kept open for parents to make comments as the experiment progressed. The extent to which either parents or students followed this suggestion is not known, but it was estimated that there was as little interest in this undertaking as in any other. It is interesting to note that letter grades were given. Each student received one grade for the nine-weeks' quarter based upon the composite evaluations of the participating teachers.

The following short courses were offered:

1. Developmental Reading
2. Beowulf
3. Mythology
4. The Language of Advertising
5. Wit and Humor in America
6. Poetry
7. The Newspaper in Society
8. The Novel
9. Research Materials and Methods
10. Dialects and the Levels of Language
11. Introduction to Drama
12. Creative Expression
13. Television Today
14. Orientation to Journalism

As in the previous experiment, systematic data was not gathered. However, at the conclusion of the experiment, the seven teachers involved met and recorded their subjective evaluations of the experiment. Their conclusions included:

1. Realization that when the experiment was first announced to students, they

seemed bewildered and disinterested. The teachers, who had been preparing for the experiment for nine weeks and were very excited, were let down by the initial attitude of the students. Only later was it realized that students who had no experience in making choices would not know how to handle this kind of situation. This conclusion became a primary factor in developing the idea of student involvement in the decision-making process.

2. Recognition that in the student-planning state, students initially did not know what to do. Parents signed the planning slips without having actually made any choices.
3. Awareness that a systematic program of counseling with students on an individual basis was essential. As students became aware of the possibilities, and after they had some experience in making choices, their degree of skill in the planning process resulted in their becoming most enthusiastic.
4. Realization that two-week courses were totally unrealistic. They were not adequate for either the subject matter or for teachers to become acquainted with their students.

From this experiment, staff members learned that if any program were developed which involved student choice, it would be essential that each student be continually involved in learning how to make decisions, an experience which led to the establishment of Glasser's House Advisor Role[11] in the emerging Roosevelt Program.

The Meadowbrook Visitation

Late in 1968, a member of the Steering Committee received materials from a former student who knew of his interest in educational innovation. The materials contained descriptions of an innovative program developed for Meadowbrook Junior High School in Newton Centre, Massachusetts, under an ESEA Title III grant. Although the printed materials were unusually complete in themselves, the Steering Committee felt that it would be beneficial for someone to visit Meadowbrook. In the spring of 1969, District 4J arranged for the chairman of the Language Arts Department and the principal to spend a week at Newton Centre, and although the Roosevelt Program goes far beyond the Meadowbrook Program in terms of change, the success of the Meadowbrook Program must be viewed as one of the primary factors in the Roosevelt staff's decision to implement its program.

A description of the Meadowbrook Program might be helpful to the reader. The following is a paraphrased description from the Meadowbrook Principal, Maurice Blum.

We have done these things at Meadowbrook:

1. First, we decided to ungrade our courses as much as possible. We felt that neither chronological age nor the number of years of school exposure necessarily determined the amount of knowledge individual students had in different subject areas.

---

[11] William Glasser, Schools Without Failure (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 122-144.

2. We arbitrarily divided the school into four equal parts--schools within a school. We wanted a close personal relationship between teachers and students in an active decision-making process.

3. We further divided students into "Houses" consisting of ten students and a teacher. In this House we hope that a close personal relationship is established. No subject matter other than the pupil and the group's progress is dealt with.

4. We let our student select most of their own courses and teachers and build their own schedules.

5. We organized and listed courses, the prerequisites, the degree of difficulty of each course, the teacher's name, and when it is offered during the week. Students know that they are expected to take courses in all major subject areas. They make their decision, sign up for the courses, and build their schedules.

6. We do not use A-B-C marks. Our instrument for evaluation and for reporting to the parents, designed by the staff, consists of a profile sheet containing scores for all the standardized tests we have on the child and a check area indicated the student's progress in terms of his own potential and the objectives of our program. This evaluation form is discussed with parents in conferences at least twice a year.

7 We give our students an opportunity for significant decision-making on a daily basis through the use of an hour of unscheduled time daily. Learning centers for each academic area are available for their use. Students may use this period of time as they see fit. The important thing is that the student is making decisions relative to his use of time to serve his objectives. He and his House advisor can review his progress in completing his study plans and his use of his unscheduled time and relate the two.[12]

The socio-economic differences between Meadowbrook and Roosevelt made any direct transfer of the Meadowbrook Program impractical. But the Roosevelt staff found useful many of the ideas Meadowbrook had been successful in implementing. And the philosophical basis on which the Roosevelt Program was to be instituted was most clearly defined by Mr. Blum:

> It is the goal . . . to develop Scholarship to help each student find true satisfaction in learning, and to understand that the subject matter skills acquired are not only useful in themselves, but are tools with which to meet situations and solve problems. Creativity: To help each student develop enough confidence in himself and others to be able to think imaginatively and explore openly ideas, values, and relationships. Motivation: To help each student become personally involved in his learning--to be free to actively explore his own resources and those of the school and the larger environment. Agency: To help each student learn how to take charge of the development of his own potential, and to understand that only he, in the long run, is responsible for his learning.[13]

While the reader will recognize that scholarship, creativity, and motivation are common in all school philosophies, agency is not, and it was the Meadowbrook definition of agency which finally articulated clearly that philosophical premise for which Roosevelt Steering Committee had been searching--that to develop a truly democratic and relevant school, the staff must make it possible for each student to be the primary agent in his own life. The staff must help him know that he is the principal determinant of all that happens to him, and they must provide opportunities for him to assume this responsibility.

The Initial Workshop

About 1960, School District 4J had established an exemplary program of summer workshop for the development of curricula as a part of a program developed with grants from the Ford Foundation. These workshops have continued, and the Roosevelt staff asked that they be given the necessary funds for a workshop during the summer of 1969. Their request was granted, and in June and July of 1969,

[12] Maurice Blum, "The Meadowbrook Program," speech presented at the University of North Carolina, July, 1967.

[13] Ibid.

twelve teachers and two administrators from Roosevelt, together with 15 teachers from the other junior high schools, worked for three weeks on junior high school program modifications. This was the first of two workshops discussed in this study. Six teachers from Cal Young Junior High School worked completely independently and had no interaction with the group. Some teachers from buildings other than Roosevelt worked semi-independently on the traditional block-of-time concept. The 14 Roosevelt staff members, together with representatives from three of the other junior high schools, devoted their efforts toward the building of a program whereby they could implement the philosophy adopted by the Roosevelt staff, as described below:

Goals With Focus on the Individual

It is the purpose of Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School . . .

. . to help each student become his own agent, learn how to take charge of the development of his own potential, and to understand that only he, in the long run, is responsible for his learning	AGENCY
. . to help each student become personally involved in his learning--to be free to actively explore his own resources and those of the school and the larger environment	MOTIVATION
. . to help each student develop enough confidence in himself and in others to be able to think imaginatively and explore openly ideas, values, and relationahips	CREATIVITY
. . to help each student find true satisfaction in learning, and to understand that the subject matter skills acquired are not only useful in themselves, but are tools with which to meet situations and solve problems[14]	SCHOLARSHIP

The workshop, although unstructured at the beginning, evolved into two phases. The first phase can be best described as sensitivity awareness. It became necessary for this group of individuals, representing all subject-matter areas, to understand that each person was as vitally interested in children as the other, and that any program which would better serve the needs of middle school children must be one built on total involvement of staff members with each other, and with the children.

The second phase of the workshop was that of program-building. The problems which called for solutions or clarifications were the traditional ones in all school programs. They were delineated as follows:

1. What subjects should be required?
2. What kind of schedule would facilitate wide choice?
3. What courses should be taught?
4. What kind of evaluation would be best?
5. How can teachers be used to better help students in an advisory capacity?
6. Should students be designated as 7th, 8th, and 9th graders?
7. What opportunities can be provided for students to pursue interests outside the organized classroom?

Consistent with the goals expressed earlier, extensive use was made of students as resource persons. As ideas germinated they were tried out on numerous students who readily volunteered. Although the concept of teachers listening to students for advice was quite foreign to most of them, the students eagerly participated when they realized that

[14]School District 4J, "Program Outline--Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School, 1969-70," Eugene, 1969. (mimeographed)

the teachers were sincere, and that they were participating in a project which might really make changes which they could see.

Two authors, William Glasser[15] and John Holt,[16] had a profound influence on the emerging Program. A majority of the Roosevelt staff was thoroughly familiar with the ideas of both men before the workshop began and during the workshop, the Roosevelt teachers incorporated the philosophical ideas of Glasser very extensively in their attempt to implement their own philosophy. In a visit to Roosevelt in the fall of 1970, the second year of the Roosevelt Program, Dr. Glasser said:

> Our work is essentially with elementary children. By the time children reach junior high school age, they are so conditioned to playing the game that we do not feel that we can reach them. I am amazed at the openness and honesty with which these children have spoken this afternoon. It is very apparent to me that our ideas will work with junior high school kids if they are given an honest chance.[17]

The workshop participants developed three possible programs before deciding to implement the one finally used. The program that emerged was as follows:

The Program[18]

Description

A. Students will have an eight-period day (40 minute periods) built on an A and B schedule. Courses will last nine weeks with students totally rescheduling every nine weeks. This pattern provides many scheduling possibilities such as 40 minutes daily, 80 minutes daily, or 80 minutes every other day. A variety of courses will be offered in every subject area, with recommendations for a good basic program emphasizing exploration.

Rationale

This schedule will provide greater flexibility and choice for the student. He will have a better opportunity to make decisions and involve himself in his own program. The student and his family will have the chance to be involved in creating an educational program best fitting his ability, interest and readiness. Natural motivation will occur as decision-making skills develop.

B. An advisor program is necessary to ensure the best implementation of the entire program. Each teacher will advise 20 students. These groups will meet daily throughout the school year, encouraging teachers and students to work and plan together.

Rationale

With this program, a student will have a base for the development of interpersonal relationships in a small group. It will be designed to provide a continuing evaluation of his educational program and to provide him an opportunity to express and find acceptance of his own basic concerns.

C. A student will be evaluated on his own rate of progress.

Rationale

Evaluation should be personalized and should become a positive and meaningful aspect of education. The program provides the opportunity for exploration and self-evaluation.

D. Grade lines will be de-emphasized to allow for individual growth and learning experience.

Rationale

This will allow the school to accommodate individual ability differences and interests. The student will be able to learn from other students of different age levels. He will become part of an outgoing educational process; no longer will grade levels impose fragmentation.

E. Resource centers will be established. Each student will spend one period daily in a structured program of independent study.

Rationale

The resource centers offer the student the opportunity to explore in an area of particular interest, to find help when he needs it, or to pursue in depth a favorite subject.

---

[15] Glasser, op. cit.

[16] John Holt, How Children Fail (New York: Dell Publishers, 1964).

[17] William Glasser, remarks given at a meeting of the staff of Roosevelt Junior High School, Eugene, Oregon, November 9, 1970.

[18] School District 4J, "Program Outline," op. cit.

At the conclusion of the workshop, the members requested that the district give them permission to begin the Program that fall (1969). It received the approval of the Area Director and the Superintendent, and in due course was approved by the Board of Directors of School District 4J, and by the Oregon State Board of Education.

During the workshop, it became apparent that there would not be time to complete the development of the program for implementation. Upon request, the Area Directors alloted further monies, and five members of the Roosevelt staff stayed on duty the remainder of the summer, assisting the principal and the vice principal with the myriad of tasks remaining before the opening of school.

Two details that were related to the workshop may be of interest to the reader. First, in the spring of 1969, anticipating the development of the Program, the principal asked parents to volunteer to serve as a sounding board. These people were called together shortly after the completion of the workshop, presented with the ideas of the Program, and asked for comments. With very little reservation, the group favored the Program's being implemented.

The second was related to those staff members who were not directly involved in the workshop. A series of meetings to orient the non-participants was held at participants' homes, in addition to several total-staff meetings. With the exception of one teacher who was in the East, every staff member had several opportunities to familiarize himself with the Program.

The writers feel that if it had not been for the workshop, with time to work and time for interpersonal reactions, the Program would never have been developed. The foundation had been laid during the preceding regular school years, but without the impetus gained during the workshop, the Program would have had little chance to get beyond the discussion stage.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

The first summer workshop ended in July, the selected leaders from the workshop worked the remainder of the summer vacation, and the Roosevelt Program was implemented in the fall of 1969.

Recognizing that the success or failure of student and parental acceptance of the Program might well rest with the initial understandings of it, the staff undertook a strenuous and uncommon method of orienting parents and students. First, descriptive handbooks, together with Program explanations and rationales for change, were mailed to every parent and student. Then every House advisor made individual appointments with each of his House advisees and his parents, and during the two weeks prior to the opening of school, sat down person-to-person and explained the Program. The lack of any serious parental opposition to so radical a change as was encompassed in the Roosevelt Program must, in part, be credited to these personal contacts.

Problems of Registration

Prior to the opening of school in 1969, a master schedule had been built and classes were established. However, no student was assigned to any classes. House advisors had helped stu-

dents build individual schedules, and the first day of school for students was designated as registration day. Registration procedures were set up similar to those used in large universities where students may enroll in courses of their choice on a first-come, first-served basis. Because teachers had agreed that they would limit the numbers of students in classes, they themselves conducted the class sign-up. Although this enrollment procedure was successful enough to get the first term started, it had a basic fault--teachers who were at registration tables were needed as student advisors. As students found certain classes full, they needed help in making further selections, and this help was not available to them. In subsequent term-registrations, the help of many parents was enlisted by teachers, and the mechanics of registration were handled entirely by parents. This not only freed teachers to act as student advisors but served to bring parents into an active role within the school, enabling them to better understand the Program by actively participating in one phase of it.

Another less-serious problem in the first registration was that of students running to get to the registration area and jostling one another for position in registration lines. In subsequent registrations, the physical area was greatly enlarged, spreading out into a much larger section of the building, and students went to the registration area in their House groups.

Problems of Class Imbalance

A question raised during the planning of the Program was whether students might not choose classes based on who was teaching them rather than the attractiveness of the courses themselves. This question had been posed to a number of Meadowbrook students during the Meadowbrook visitation, and without exception they said that they chose teachers first and courses second.

A random sample of 55 Roosevelt students was selected and this question was presented to them. The results indicated that students who had attended Roosevelt previously for one year or more tended to select the teacher first and the course second. Students who were new to the school tended to select the teacher first only if they had been able to obtain "information" about the teacher from more knowledgeable peers. The latter happened infrequently enough that this phenomenon of selection posed no real problem to scheduling in the Program.

During the first year of the Program, there were only two teachers who were not able to carry their reasonable share of students because students failed to register for their classes. Both of these teachers were older, and the problem cannot really be related to the Program because, in previous years, it had become more and more difficult to assign students to their classes and keep them there because of the teachers' almost complete inability to make the teaching process meaningful, and to relate with kids in any fashion other than the traditional.

An important factor which operated to keep class enrollments quite evenly balanced was the transient nature of the student body. Including the turnover of ninth graders going to the high school, slightly more than 50% of the Roosevelt

students were new each year. This had a distinct effect in keeping the teaching reputations of poorer teachers from affecting class balance.

The flexibility offered each student in changing his schedule each nine-week period offered a solution to another problem in the traditional schedule. In traditional scheduling, the student was generally assigned to specific teachers for specific subjects and he remained with these teachers for the entire year. For those students who were assigned to superior teachers, this method was most satisfactory. For those students who were assigned to mediocre teachers, the traditional method was inadequate in two ways: First, it relegated the student to an entire year with an inadequate teacher; and second, it deprived him of the opportunity for contact with a superior teacher. Roosevelt had several superior teachers, and students who remained in the school (and their parents) constantly pressed for class assignments with them. Rebuilding of schedules four times yearly brought a rather natural solution. All students were able to have superior teachers for at least a part of each year. This appears to have made the acceptance of average and mediocre teaching more palatable.

Problems of House

One of the more tenuous, yet vitally critical areas of the Program was that of the House organization. In the traditional program at Roosevelt, guidance was handled by guidance specialists and the block-time program. Van Til, Vars, and Lounsbury[19] indicate that virtually all guidance functions in junior high programs are approached through these and the homeroom organization. The Program, with its university-style of registration, could not utilize these traditional methods, and the staff established the House organization, patterned after a model of William Glasser. He describes his model as follows:

> . . . I shall give a detailed description of the previously introduced classroom meetings, meetings in which the teacher leads a whole class in a non-judgmental discussion about what is important and relevant to them. There are three types of classroom meetings; the social-problem-solving meeting, concerned with the students' social behavior in school; the open-ended meeting, concerned with the intellectually important subjects; and the educational-diagnostic meeting, concerned with how well the students understand the concepts of the curriculum. These meetings should be a part of the regular school curriculum.[20]

House, as conceived by the Roosevelt staff, went further than Glasser had suggested. The House advisors assumed the responsibility not only for the role suggested by Glasser, but for most of the guidance responsibilities formerly delegated to the counselors and to the block-time teachers. In addition, they also assumed full responsibility for student scheduling, a task formerly delegated primarily to administrative personnel. House was held daily for 25 minutes throughout the year, becoming very much a part of the curriculum, as suggested by Glasser.

Two problems developed that were related to House. The first was the problem of teachers who

---

[19]William Van Til, Gordon F. Vars, and John H. Lounsbury, Modern Education for the Junior High School Years (Indianapolis and Kansas City: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967) pp. 430-433.

[20]Glasser, op. cit.

were not able to function in this kind of setting. Several teachers could not operate in an unstructured situation adequately. They were able to handle routine duties such as scheduling, but the day-by-day House meetings presented formidable obstacles and they appear to have taken one of two routes--withdrawal, permitting students to do what they pleased, or total structure as within a traditional classroom. It was not the purpose of this study to propose solutions to this problem, but it should be pointed out that there was some evidence that the inability of some teachers to relate with young people in the school setting without resorting to the traditional teacher-pupil concept is a serious problem within the Program; indeed, it is a serious problem within much of the American educational process.

The second problem related to House was that the assignment of students to Houses arbitrarily was completely contrary to the philosophy of free choice so inherent in the Program. Students were very quick to recognize this discrepancy, and the staff--to be philosophically honest--might have made provision for students to choose their House advisors. Fear of overloading some Houses, and leaving others without students, were the dominant factors in the staff's decision to arbitrarily assign students, a fear that, as of the time of this study, had not been alleviated. Again, it was not the purpose of this study to suggest alternatives, but rather to direct attention to the problems as they presented themselves to the end that others might preclude similar experiences if they were informed on such matters.

It was not meant to convey that only problems characterized the House organization. Generally speaking, the intentions of House were realized--a most important one being the success of many of the teachers in helping children to relate with all members of their Houses in a truly democratic manner. It was speculated at this time that if the Program proved to be a failure in the years beyond this study, might it not be due, in critical measure, to the inability of those staff members who, for whatever reasons, related to students in the traditional autocratic pupil-teacher manner.

Student Evaluation

During the development of the Program, the staff devoted much study to the problem of student evaluation. They were again greatly influenced by the concepts of Glasser, who pointed out that the one school practice which leads to failure more often than any other is grading.[21] The following concepts were agreed upon during the initial workshop to be implemented at the end of each nine-week period:

* Traditional letter-grades would be abandoned.
* An evaluation of each student's progress would be written out.
* The use of scales was discouraged.
* Departments were encouraged to try various methods.
* Credit would be given when a student satisfactorily completed a course; if it were not satisfactorily completed, no credit would be given, nor would the fact that the student had ever been in the class be recorded.
* Student self-evaluation and concurrent student-teacher evaluation were strongly encouraged.

---

[21] Glasser, op. cit., p. 59-69.

In spite of the planning which had gone into evaluation, the first evaluation period in November, 1969, caught most of the staff relatively unprepared. Departments and individual teachers experimented with various forms of evaluation reports, ranging from blank pieces of paper to very elaborately-constructed rating sheets(see Appendix D). Many individual evaluation forms contained lengthy written evaluations of students' work; others contained only a sentence, or perhaps only a mark on a scale.

During the second nine-week term, a faculty committee was appointed to work with students and teachers to better unify the approach to the evaluation process, and out of this committee's work developed the concept of proficiency levels. Teachers were encouraged to define those levels of proficiency in their subject areas which they felt students should reach. The proficiency level would then be the dividing line between credit for a course, and no credit. Again teachers were encouraged to specifically enumerate proficiency levels on their term reports, and indicate to parents how well proficiency levels were reached.

While many of the mechanical details of evaluation were made to operate more smoothly, two rather serious problems emerged, and solutions had not been found by the end of the first year of the Program. The first was the problem of parents' concern about the lack of letter grades. Glasser had said that "anyone who raises a voice against them (grades) finds himself in the center of a hurricane . . ."[22] and while the actual numbers of parents who expressed concern about the lack of grades were small, they were most vociferous. At the writing of this paper, in the second year of the Program, this problem has not diminished.

The second problem, one which also has not been solved, is the unreasonable amount of time which is required for teachers to prepare written evaluations of students in the numbers which are required in the Program. Little progress was made during the first year toward solution of this problem. Aggravating this problem was the fact that teachers were writing curriculum as they taught, and this, combined with the unbelievable amount of time required for written evaluations, became a problem which could only be endured by the most dedicated. There is evidence to indicate that the time factor required in the present evaluation process is second only in seriousness to the House advisory problem as discussed earlier, and that solutions to both of these problems may force rather extensive modifications of the Program in the future.

An Analysis of Actual Student Choice

Earlier in the study, it was postulated that if students were given a wide choice of subjects, they would tend to select courses which would reflect a balanced program; that free choice did not preclude traditional courses but, in fact, broadened the probabilities of enriching the students' experiences either in place of--or in addition to--those offerings characteristic of other curricula. This was an attempt to determine the validity of this postulate. Seventy-four student

[22] Glasser, op. cit., p. 59.

schedules were randomly selected for analysis. The basic required subjects in a typical traditional program were compared with those subjects actually selected by Roosevelt students.

Table I indicated actual student choice as compared with required subjects in a traditional schedule.

TABLE I

A COMPARISON OF COURSE UNITS SELECTED IN A FREE CURRICULUM WITH THOSE IN A REQUIRED, TRADITIONAL CURRICULUM[a]

	Requirements in Traditional Schedule	Actual Choice in Roosevelt Prog.
Course Areas	Req. Units	Chosen Units
Language Arts	4	5.4
Social Studies	4	4.8
Mathematics	4	3.7
Science	2.66	1.7
Physical Educ.	4	3.5

[a]Figures are expressed as averages computed from 74 sample schedules, with one unit representing one class for nine weeks

This table suggests that the staff's position on the postulation: giving students free choice in selecting subjects would not preclude traditional courses but, in fact, broadened the probabilities of enriching students' experiences, was justified. In the language arts, students selected 35% more courses than they would have had in a traditional program. In the social studies, they selected 20% more courses. It was discovered by examining individual schedules that one student selected twelve language arts courses, and another selected twelve social studies courses. Yet the student in the sample that selected the most physical education courses chose only ten, and still chose five language arts classes and two social studies classes, in addition to an excellent variety of others. This information is in marked contrast with the fears expressed by some parents who felt that if students were given a free choice many of them would take nothing but physical education classes.

The figures in Table I seem to indicate that students chose less mathematics than would have been required. This is not entirely accurate. While there was a requirement in the traditional program that all students take mathematics every year, ten percent of all ninth graders were excused because of their inability to profit from further mathematics instruction in junior high school. It is interesting to note that within the entire sample of 74, only four students took no mathematics at all, and only two others were enrolled for less than four units.

There were 35% fewer science classes selected than would have been taken in the traditional program. This represents a significant decline and suggests need for additional study. Other requirements from the traditional program such as art, music, industrial arts, and home economics cannot be meaningfully presented because of the lack of uniformity in application of the requirement policy.

Of pressing concern was the matter of student exploration. The first postulation of the Roosevelt Program was that the traditional program showed little evidence that students actually had

the opportunity to explore a broad spectrum of courses and that they were actually locked into an almost totally-prescribed program. In the traditional program, seventh grade students were given experience in eight areas; eighth and ninth grade students each were given opportunities in seven areas. There were few exceptions. An examination of our sample shows that no student selected classes in fewer than six different areas, and only four students chose as few as six. Seventy-seven percent of the students selected classes in eight or more areas with one student making selections in twelve areas. Evidence here clearly indicates that when students are given a free choice of subjects, they will, indeed, explore the curriculum to a much greater extent than they are able to do in the traditional program (see Table II).

It becomes readily apparent from this table, that students invested a large percentage of their time in what has become known as the "traditional subject areas." In addition, however, students initiated and pursued a wider variety of content areas that went beyond the traditional curriculum to include as many unique and interesting topics for study as there were staff available to assist with them.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF COURSE AREAS SELECTED BY STUDENTS

# of Course Areas	# of Students	Percentage
6	4	5%
7	13	17%
8	23	31%
9	25	34%
10	6	8%
11	2	3%
12	1	1%

The position postulated was that the "free choice" approach enables this to take place and, further, that the participation of the students in the total process was probably equally important as the mastery of the subject matter itself.

While, from the writer's point of view, the support for the first and second postulations is substantial, no claim is made or implied that the students in the Program actually learned more or less.

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST YEAR

The first year of the Program ended June, 1970, and the staff's total efforts turned to evaluation.

Specific areas reviewed here are the second workshop, student and parent reactions to the program, and the direction given for the second year. These areas are included here because the results of the workshop proved to be a critical point in the subsequent development of the Program. This, together with collected parental and student opinions, gave the necessary basis for continuing the Program.

The Second Workshop

The second workshop was held the week following the close of the school year. It lasted nine working days and comprised 23 teachers from the Roosevelt staff. Unlike the first workshop, there were no teachers or administrators from other school staffs.

The workshop participants as a group first listed those problems in the Program of most pressing concern to them. After the problems were defined, participants selected those in which

they were especially interested and organized themselves accordingly. Seventy percent of the time was spent in small group work wherein problem-solving activities took place. The remainder was spent in large-group sessions where the results of the small-group work were shared and positions taken.

The workshop staff defined a number of problems for consideration. Among them were two of primary concern--the evaluation procedure, and the House organization.

The Evaluation Procedure

The workshop made the following recommendations pertaining to the evaluation procedure for the second year of the Program:

1. Evaluations will be in terms of individual progress.
2. We believe that individualized evaluation forms are a strength of the program.
3. Each teacher must consider all four of the evaluative areas: Agency - Motivation - Creativity - Scholarship. It will be preferable to evaluate each area separately.
4. Evaluative guidelines for these areas need to be established within departments.
5. The teacher-recommendation section of the written evaluation should be an important and distinctly separate part of the evaluation format.
6. Incompletes require a recommendation (repeat the course, assignments to complete, etc.).
7. Recommendations should be made regarding future course selections. These recommendations must reach advisors in time to be useful during the next registration period.
8. Warning slips about lack of progress should be given to House advisors prior to the sixth week.
9. Teachers should consult with advisors prior to making phone calls to parents. Advisors, having the total responsibility for each student, can give individual teachers an overview of the student's progress in all areas, information which is more meaningful to parents than individual subject-matter reports.[23]

House Organization and Policies

The workshop made the following recommendations pertaining to the House organization and policies for the second year of the Program:

1. House will continue to meet every day as during the first year of the Program, for 26 minutes daily, the first thing every morning.
2. Students will stay in their original House assignments unless specific arrangements are made through the counselor.
3. A concerted effort will be made to have all staff members accept the "Statement of Belief" as follows--

> The Roosevelt Junior High Program encourages the student to become an active participant in the learning process. By its very nature the program demands a place and group with which the student can identify and relate. House provides the place, with the aid of his advisor, where the student can clarify his goals and evaluate his progress in relation to them.
>
> Students need effective ways of bringing their ideas, backgrounds and understandings into contact with sympathetic adults as well as their peers. In this informal atmosphere the advisor promotes individuality and advances rational decision-making. Democracy demands that its citizens participate in the decisions which affect them. We cannot educate for passive conformity; we need active and involved students.
>
> The primary goal of House is to have each student develop his full potential, not only in skills and competencies associated with an academic education, but also in terms of his humanness, his feelings toward himself as a learner, his relationship with his peers, teachers and other adults, his aspirations, interests and goals, and his competence to deal courageously with his own life.
>
> We know that self-concept is learned--people aren't born with it. They learn the concepts which they have of themselves and since they learn it, it is a problem for us in House to do something about helping students develop better ones than they have had.
>
> There is a great deal of evidence supporting the notion that the way a teacher feels

---

[23] Roosevelt staff, "Workshop Report," Eugene, July, 1970. (mimeographed)

about his students and the way the student feels about himself is of critical importance for learning. When students are convinced that they can learn, and that others, namely teachers, also are convinced they can learn, they in fact do learn. It is extremely important that advisors believe in their students and that this belief be open enough to be perceived by the student. Then expectations of the student and of the teacher tend to be fulfilled. Positive self-esteem is a requisite for learning. House is of primary importance here. G. B. Shaw said it best in the last scene of Pygmalion: ". . . the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how she's treated."

The all-important aspect of the House is the basic relationship that exists between a dedicated adult and the total House--small group and individual student--that reinforces, guides, develops confidence, and above all makes each student realize that "I am important," "He cares," "I can do it," "I am not alone." This student is then willing to work hard to reach complex and difficult goals.

Since the House is at the core of the Roosevelt Program, it presents many problems and confusions to House advisors. Techniques and suggestions can be presented, but each individual needs to work out his own relationships. No one is going to be totally satisfied with what he does, either with individuals or with the House group, but he can get support from the administrators, guidance counselors, and other team members. The important factor is that we keep trying and have faith that we can do it--and we are not alone in trying.[24]

The Role of the House Advisor

The workshop made the following recommendations pertaining to the role of the House advisor for the second year of the Program:

1. The relationship between the advisor and advisee is to reinforce, guide, develop confidence and make the student feel that he has worth.

2. The advisor must contact the parents of at least three advisees each month. Time for these contacts will be given in lieu of faculty meetings.

3. House attendance will be required and treated the same as classroom attendance. Advisors must meet from 8:00 - 8:26 a.m. with their Houses.

4. The advisor will keep one folder for each advisee. The following items should be included in this folder:

   a. A copy of the current term's schedule
   b. A copy of the yearly schedule of classes
   c. Records of conferences about, or with, the student
   d. Information from advisees' teachers
   e. Duplicate copies of each term's evaluations

5. House is the place where discussion about the Program should be totally free and unrestricted.

6. Advisors will be responsible for the following registration:

   a. To know the catalogue well enough to give suggestions to students and parents
   b. To see that each student is ready for registration procedures
   c. To give his opinion and direction for a balanced schedule

7. It is recommended that the advisor contact the home and counselor whenever he sees problems arising with an advisee.

8. The House advisor is responsible for orienting his students to the following:

   a. School policies
   b. Registration procedures
   c. Scheduling
   d. Course offerings
   e. Evaluations
   f. The philosophy of House
   g. Study labs and study hall

9. It is mandatory that each advisor use the booklet of ideas, communication skills, case studies and general school policy to aid in House discussions during the first three weeks.[25]

The Role of Parents

The workshop made the following recommendations pertaining to the role of parents and advisor contact with them for the second year of the Program:

1. It is recommended that each advisor invite two or three parents to meet with his House each term.

2. It is recommended that communication between the school and home be kept open.

3. It is recommended that the advisor use parents in the registration process in order

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

to free the advisor for helping students.

4. It is recommended that the advisor use parents as resource people for House discussions.[26]

Student Reaction to the Program

In June, 1970, at the close of the school year, the staff distributed an opinionnaire to all students through their Houses (see Appendix B). The reader would be interested to know that during the second year of the Program, provision was made for a part-time member of the staff who is also working in a doctoral program, to assume the responsibilities for evaluation procedures, and it is assumed that more systematic methods of gathering data will be employed. The results of the opinionnaire were as follows:

1. Of the four items dealing with the mixing of grade levels, seventh and eighth graders answered more favorably than did ninth graders.

2. Of the items dealing with the House organization, a majority felt that House was a good idea; students three to one favored having House although those considering experiences in House to be worthwhile were only two to one.

3. Students expressed strong liking for the opportunity to select their own courses.

4. The amount of student involvement in selecting their own courses increased with each age level. The biggest jump was between eighth and ninth graders. Students generally felt that they made their own decisions, with suggestions from their parents.

5. Most students felt that their parents were interested in their schedules. More than half felt that their parents were very interested.

6. Two items dealt with the role of the advisor in course selection. Few students felt that advisors forced decisions upon them; most felt that they were helpful. Forty-six percent of the students worked with advisors to plan and schedule; 12% of the students felt that they did not get help from their advisors; 40% stated that they did not seek the help of their advisors. There was evidence that advisors were playing active roles in advising, but in cases of disagreement, contact between parents and advisors should have been greater.

7. Forty-seven percent of the students felt that the school should not require students to take certain subjects; 34% felt that the school should have required subjects; 19% were not sure.

8. The number of students not getting the courses they wanted was insignificant. Most students were satisfied with the courses they had.

9. There was no significant dissatisfaction with the alternating day schedule. Students liked it.

10. Students seem to view teachers more favorable than before and felt that their approaches were more interesting. Students felt that teachers had more desirable personalities.

11. Students felt that the atmosphere of the school had changed. They indicated much more interest in school than they had had previously.

12. Most courses were considered useful by the students. There appeared to be a definite relationship between choosing one's own courses and seeing value in them.

13. Students were nearly unanimous in approving the idea of changing courses and teachers every nine weeks.

14. An insignificant number of students of all three age levels expressed any dissatisfaction with the variety of courses.

15. Sixty-seven percent of the students felt that they had done more school work this year than previously. Ten percent felt they had done less.

16. There seemed to be no changes in student perception of the amount of homework in the new program as compared with previous years.

17. Study labs continued to be used as a place to work on subject matter, and not as a place for students to pursue special interests.

18. Fifty percent of the students felt that they participated in school more this year; 14% felt they participated less; 36% felt they participated about the same amount this year as last.

19. Of the items dealing with student evaluations, 70% approved of the evaluation method; 14%

---

[26] Ibid.

were dissatisfied; 16% had no feeling one way or the other.

20. Fifty-five percent of the students felt they would be influenced in how they registered for courses if they knew that letter grades would be given in some courses; 25% said they would not be influenced; 20% said they were not sure.

21. There was evidence that students did not see a relationship between letter grades and the quality of their school work.27

While one might challenge the validity of the opinionnaire in statistical terms, it is the opinion of some that it provides important evidence about the feelings of students toward various aspects of the Program. Especially significant is the evidence of increased student interest in assuming the responsibility for selection of courses, student expression that teachers were teaching in a more interesting manner, the belief by half of the students that they had participated in school more than during the previous year, and that the atmosphere of the school had changed in a positive manner.

Parent Reaction to the Program

At the same time that the student opinionnaire was given to students, a questionnaire was mailed to all parents of children enrolled at Roosevelt. Approximately 180 were returned and the results are presented below:

1. When you first heard of the change of program at Roosevelt, what was your reaction?

a. For it	80	44.4%
b. Against it	23	12.8%
c. Didn't know	77	42.8%

2. Do you feel not having letter grades is a good idea?

a. Yes	97	62.9%
b. No	57	37.1%

3. Do you feel that the current evaluations sufficiently inform you and your child of his progress?

a. Yes	100	60.6%
b. No	65	39.4%

4. If rating the amount of learning you feel your child is doing, how would you compare it with the amount he was learning under the traditional program?

a. More	89	52.3%
b. Less	45	23.4%
c. The same	36	24.3%

5. If rating the amount of homework you feel your child is doing, how would you compare it with the amount he was doing under the traditional system?

a. More	12	7.4%
b. Less	76	46.6%
c. The same	75	46.0%

6. Do you think your child has made wise decisions in his selection of courses?

a. Yes	145	86.8%
b. No	22	13.2% 28

The questionnaire which was sent to parents did not ask several questions which in retrospect became obvious. Answers to such questions as the ones listed below might have proven highly useful.

1. Were there significant qualitative differences among different teachers' evaluations of students?

2. Parents who felt that their children learned more under the traditional program ought to have had adequate opportunity to explain what advantages their children had under the traditional program that they did not have in the new Program.

3. What number of parents were included in some helping aspect of the school program that had not previously been participants, and was there a correlation between this involvement and their feelings and understandings of the Program?

4. In what way did parents who felt that the selections were unwise feel they were unwise,

---

[27] Donald M. Jackson, "Summaries of Student Responses to an Opinionnaire," (unpublished report to School District 4J Board of Directors, Eugene, Oregon, July, 1970).

[28] Ibid.

> and how might the school personnel modify their behavior in order to make wise selections possible?

Of the questions asked in the questionnaire, the final one which asks parent opinion regarding the wisdom of course selections made by students is the most significant. Only 13.2% felt that students' selections were unwise; 85.8% expressed the belief that their children made wise choices. In the responses to this question lies adequate proof of the staff postulation that if students were given a wide choice of subjects and a free choice among those subjects, they would select courses which would be acceptable to most tradition-oriented parents.

Other information presented to the Board of Directors was indicative of the success of portions of the Program:

> During the 1969-70 school year, Roosevelt accepted 32 superintendent's transfers (students) from all over the district. The majority of these students were having extreme problems at their former schools. All except three finished the year at Roosevelt.
>
> We experienced a 4.75% average absentee rate this year, as compared with 6% the previous year. Absentee rates at the other junior high schools has continued at the 6% level and higher.[29]

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are warranted:

1. Administrative behavior which encouraged teachers to explore new ideas and ways of working with children was of importance in development of the Program.

There is considerable research to indicate that regardless of how innovative staff members may be, innovation does not occur in public schools unless the administrators support it. Brickell's work[30] in this area was referred to earlier in this paper. Rogers pointed out that "the crucial role of school administrators in causing a school to be more or less innovative warrants special emphasis . . . [31] Demeter concluded that

> Building principals are key figures in the (innovative) process. Where they are both aware of and sympathetic to an innovation, it tends to prosper. Where they are ignorant of its existence, or apathetic if not hostile, it tends to remain outside the bloodstream of the school.[32]

2. Equally important was the recognition by the teaching staff that the traditional program was not providing the kind of education needed in today's world, and their willingness to try innovation.

An innovative principal cannot successfully initiate innovation without teachers who recognize the shortcomings of today's educational programs and are willing to try innovation. Two classroom teachers who have expressed the concern for today's youth and the traditional education system, Kohl[33] and Kozol,[34] have described the kind of things teachers want to do in classrooms to excite and stimulate children. Many members of the Roosevelt staff exhibited these kinds of enthusiasms and concerns, and in the atmosphere created at Roosevelt, they were able to implement their ideas

---

[29] Ibid.

[30] Brickell, op. cit.

[31] Everett M. Rogers, "What are Innovators Like" in Change Processes in the Public Schools, ed. by Joanne M. Kitchel (University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969), p. 61.

[32] Lee H. Demeter, "Accelerating the Local Use of Improved Educational Practices in School Systems," (unpublished D.Ed. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 23.

[33] Herbert R. Kohl, The Open Classroom (New York: Vintage Books, 1969).

[34] Jonathan Kozol, Death at an Early Age (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1967).

and test ideas for solutions to educational problems related to today's middle school education.

3. It was shown that when middle school children are given a totally free curricular choice, they select courses distributed in a pattern not unlike traditional requirements.

One of the most commonly-heard criticisms of the Roosevelt Program has been that middle school children could not and would not choose the "necessary" courses for a "good education" if they were given a free choice. Evidence indicates these charges as being unsubstantiated. Indeed, it was most exciting to discover that not only are middle school children, with guidance, capable of building balanced programs, but actually over-subscribe in the basic areas of language arts and social studies. What more convincing evidence could be found to promote the concept of breaking away from rigid, traditional requirements and schedules?

4. Data was presented which indicates that students in a totally free curricular-choice situation have a much broader opportunity to use the middle school in its exploratory function as opposed to the rigidity of traditional programs.

The most basic tenet of advocates of the junior high school program has long been that the junior high school must provide exploratory opportunities for the adolescent. Concern was expressed earlier that what has been developed as an "exploratory" program was, in reality, an extremely rigid program in which children explore those areas which have been chosen for them by adults, have little or no choice in the areas they may explore, and are victims of programs which are really built for administrative convenience. John Bremer, program director for the Parkway Program in Philadelphia said that "It is not possible to improve the high school; it has reached the end of its development. We need a new kind of educational institution."[35] His comments could well pertain to the junior high school, and the Roosevelt Program, could be one new kind of educational institution.

5. Information was presented which clearly indicates that most aspects of the Roosevelt Program are more acceptable to parents and students than the traditional program. Evidence of increased student enthusiasm, success with student transfers from other district junior high schools, and a decrease in student attendance problems at Roosevelt indicate that the Program is one successful approach to helping the middle school more adequately meet the needs of today's youth.

One has only to spend a few hours in a traditional junior high school, then walk into the halls of Roosevelt Junior High School. One senses immediately startling differences. In the traditional junior high, the halls and office are usually quiet; students appear to be "receiving" their education. At Roosevelt the halls and office reflect a total involvement of students and teachers. The most commonly-made statement by the more than 300

---

[35]The School District of Philadelphia, "The Parkway Program," Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May, 1959. (mimeographed)

visitors to Roosevelt during the school year 1969-1970 was that students were obviously very enthusiastic about school, a quality not commonly found in today's schools.

The Roosevelt Program has many positive qualities which make it essential that the experiment be continued for the total three-year period for which it was originally planned.

Epilogue

This paper covers the first year of the Roosevelt "experiment." It seems appropriate at this time to reflect briefly upon the intervening years following the "study period" up until the present.

When the Roosevelt Program was first implemented all resources and energy available were needed just to establish the program and get it off the ground. The staff was well aware of the need for curriculum evaluation but postponed discussion of this phase until all the program's components were operating. Informal evaluation by staff members themselves constantly occurred, however, as demonstrated by the numerous discussions and meetings which focused on how to improve the fledgling program. The many small changes which were made by the staff over the three year period also indicate the effort made to bring philosophy and actual program closer together.

The first formal effort to gather data about the program involved the questionnaire previously mentioned given to parents of Roosevelt students. A faculty committee developed the questionnaire at the end of the program's first year to determine the level of community support. Parent response was generally favorable though a sizeable number indicated a "wait and see" attitude.

As the program moved through its second year as an "experiment," the need for more evaluation became apparent. During the final quarter of the 1970-71 school year a more systematic effort was made to gather additional data regarding the various aspects of the program. The problem was in deciding what data would be most valuable to gather. "Prove that your program is not hurting kids," became the challenge uttered by several persons within the District. And as negative as that approach first sounds, it nevertheless provided the basis for several projects which were developed.

Since the program was only two years old and since a more comprehensive evaluative report was to be made at the end of the third year, the data gathered and the conclusions made in 1971 were considered tentative and somewhat indefinite. Among the findings made at that time however were the following:

1. Roosevelt students continued to do as well on the Iowa Test of Educational Development as former students at the school. Roosevelt students had always scored high on this standardized test and this trend continued.

2. An analysis of what students were selecting in a curriculum with no required classes showed that Roosevelt students, with few exceptions, were choosing a "balanced diet" of subjects. Those who anticipated that "few would take English or social studies courses" were surprised to learn that on the average Roosevelt students were actually enrolled in more English and social studies classes than they did take or even could have taken in the more traditional program at the school.

3. Roosevelt teachers, responding to a questionnaire, gave their strong support for the program's continuation. They indicated that what they liked best was the "opportunity to be innovative and creative" in their work. What they liked least was the

problem of being overworked and "not having enough time to get everything done well."

4. A student body questionnaire resulted in an expression of strong support for the new curriculum. The "freedom to choose classes" was of course what students liked most about the program. A number of students expressed concern about the usefulness of the House program where advisor and advisees met daily in a non-task oriented setting. This area of the program became the high priority of concern for the staff. During the third year of the Program the faculty sought to re-examine the House concept and look for better ways to implement this aspect of the program.

   One of the other notable pieces of information gathered from the Roosevelt student body was the apparent turnabout in attitude toward the grading system used. At the end of the program's first year, it was apparent that a sizeable number of students would have preferred to retain the traditional letter grade system formerly used at Roosevelt. By the end of the second year, 75% of the students actually preferred the credit - incomplete system of evaluation or some variation of this plan.

With the second year of the Roosevelt Program completed, about 25 members of the staff participated in a summer curriculum workshop to refine objectives and goals for departments and establish in writing specific goals and objectives for the many new courses being constantly generated in the program.

As the program's third year began, program evaluation was given heavy emphasis. All staff members were involved in some way in assisting efforts to collect additional data. A half-time person was assigned from the staff to work with the District's Office of Research on various projects. In addition to this "in house" evaluation, the Eugene School Board expressed interest in having an outside evaluator examine the program. As a result of this interest, Superintendent Pond invited Dr. Albert G. Leep, Associate Professor of Education from Ohio University to visit Eugene and make some observation of the Roosevelt Program. Based on a number of different materials available to him, numerous interviews with students and staff members at Roosevelt, plus additional contacts with other personnel in the Eugene District, Dr. Leep issued a summary of his five-day visit. To summarize Dr. Leep's summary would be an injustice. However, his report was positive in nature but did offer a number of suggestions for future consideration. The following are a few of his remarks:

> Roosevelt Junior High School is an exciting place to be. Students, teachers and parents are involved in varying degrees in a program which is continually becoming. It is a program in ferment; consequently, it is appealing, challenging, frustrating and frightening all at the same time and in differing amounts to those participating in it . . . I would hope that the Roosevelt Program would continue and that it remain in a state of ferment.[36]

Besides Dr. Leep's report to the Eugene School Board, additional information was prepared for a presentation made in May, 1972. The sum total of this evaluation report was to provide the basis for the School Board's decision to continue, modify or reject the Roosevelt Program. Some of the additional information provided the Board included the following:

1. Results of the Roosevelt Parent Survey indicate that there is support from the Roosevelt community to continue the program. With 78% of Roosevelt parents responding to the questionnaire, 59% of the persons favored continuation of the program in its present form. Thirty percent (30%) favored continuation of the program but with some modification. Ten percent (10%) of the Roosevelt parents expressed a desire to return to a more traditional program.

---

[36]Albert G. Leep, "Observations of The Roosevelt School Program," (unpublished report to the Board of Directors and Superintendent of Schools of District 4J, Eugene, Oregon, March, 1972).

a. Parents reported the greatest source of satisfaction in the program is the opportunity to choose the courses their children will take in junior high school from the variety offered.

b. Of least satisfaction to parents is the lack of communication with House advisors.

c. Parents reported over 2-1/2 times the number of positive changes in their children's attitude or behavior than negative changes since attending Roosevelt.

2. Results of the Iowa Test of Educational Development again demonstrated in 1971 that Roosevelt students continued to do as well as former students. Test scores were compared for each year beginning with 1967.

3. Students from Roosevelt entering high school as sophomores attained as high a grade point average (using the average for the class) as sophomores who entered the same high school but who attended a different junior high. A comparison of grade point averages showed little, if any, difference between the two groups of students.

4. Based on a year-long study of seventh graders at Roosevelt and another junior high school in Eugene with a similar population, the following three findings were reported:

a. The number of positive comments about the Roosevelt Program increased between October and May for a group of 16 seventh grade students interviewed at four different times during the school year.

b. Student attitude towards school between seventh grade students at Roosevelt and the other junior high were compared on 14 different groups of questions. The major difference in attitude toward school involved a group of questions that focused on encouraging students to participate in deciding how classes will be conducted. The students from Roosevelt scored significantly higher on these questions than did the students from the other school.

c. Twelve comparisons were made between the mathematics achievement of the seventh grade sample from Roosevelt and the other school. In general, the students at Roosevelt scored slightly higher than did students from the other school sample. However, only four of these differences were significant. This is of particular interest since the instructional period at Roosevelt is 40 minutes in length as compared to 50 minutes at the other junior high school.

5. An analysis of courses taken by ninth graders at the end of two and one-half years (10 quarters) showed a wide range in the number of subjects in which students enrolled. Such variability would be expected at Roosevelt since the program's philosophy encourages students, parents, and advisors to individualize student schedules on the basis of needs and interests. For purposes of comparison, however, the table below shows the percentage of students who enrolled in the same number or more than the number of quarters formerly required in the traditional program at Roosevelt:

Quarters Formerly Required	Subject Area	% of Students Enrolled in Same or More than Formerly Required
10	English	71%
10	Social Studies	64%
10	Mathematics	67%
10	Physical Education	31%
6	Science	39%

With the information and feedback available to the School Board action was taken regarding the future of the Roosevelt Program. The staff was given a green light by the Board to continue. Since many of the program evaluation reports implied suggestions for improving the school's curriculum, the staff developed a series of items or concerns to be worked on during the 1972-73 school year as a condition for the program's continuation. With its "experimental" status shed, the curriculum at Roosevelt has become an established program in the Eugene community, though it continues, like all truly innovative programs, to be a source of debate and controversy.

APPENDIX A

COURSE OFFERINGS - 1969-1970

List of All Courses Offered - 1969-1970

Each class was nine weeks unless otherwise indicated. Every class was not necessarily offered every term.

ART

Art I
Art II
Ceramics
Ceramics and Ceramic Sculpture
Creative Photography
Creative Stitchery
Drawing and Painting
Film Making and Visual Continuity
Jewelry and Enameling
Lettering, Calligraphy and Creative Bookbinding
Macrame: Art of Creative Knotting
Sculpture
Textile Design
Weaving
Advanced Art Program
Print-making Survey
Exploring Ceramics

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

French A (first year)
French B (second year)
French C (third year)
Spanish A (first year)
Spanish B (second year)
Spanish C (third year)
Conversational German

LANGUAGE ARTS

Approaches to Reading Literature
Basic Communication: Listening and Speaking Skills
Black Studies (also Social Studies)
Children's Literature
Composition I
Conflict
Creative Writing I & II
Dialects and Levels of Language
Expanded Consciousness
Heroes, Gods and Monsters
How Our Language Works I & II
Information Detective
Literature of Religion
The Novel
Power of the Pen: Modern Satire
Reading: Freedom to Explore
Reading I: Phonics
Reading II: Structural Analysis
Reading III: Speed & Comprehension
Reading IV: Traditional Grammar Techniques
Research Methods & Materials
Science Fiction
Story Telling and Oral Interpretation I & II
Student Publications
Type-Comp
Writing and You
Creative Drama I & II
Dialogues of Plato
Expanded Moment (Poetry)
Folk Music (also Music)
Freedom to Explore
The Library
Literature of the North
Martian Mythology
The Odyssey
People, Places, and Projects
Popular Music (also Music)
Reading Lab
Shakespeare
The Short Story
Writing Word Pictures
World Mythology
Writing Four Pore Spellerz
Writing Lab

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

Metalworking I
Metalworking II
Metalworking III
Woodworking, Power Mechanics I
Woodworking, Power Mechanics II
Woodworking III
Power Mechanics III
Electricity-Electronics, Drafting I
Electricity-Electronics, Drafting II
Electricity-Electronics III
Drafting III
Mass-Production--Wood
Small Engine Overhaul
Marquetry: Wood Inlaying
Finishing & Refinishing
Project Construction, Wood, Power
Foundry
Industrial Fastenings
Forging
Decorative Design
Project Construction, Electronics
Introduction to Computers
Surveying and Map Making
Maintenance & Care of Shop Equipment (Wood)
Maintenance & Care of Shop Equipment (Metal)
Long Bow Construction

MATHEMATICS

Arithmetic I
Arithmetic II
Math I
Math II
Math I & II (Pre-Algebra)
Math III (Algebra)
Math IV (Geometry)
General Math I

MATHEMATICS (continued)

General Math II
Instruments for Calculating and Measuring

HOME ECONOMICS

Home Economics I
Home Economics II
General Clothing
Advanced General Clothing
Sewing with Knits II
Sewing with Wool Fabrics
Tailoring
General Foods
Sewing With Knits I (3 weeks)
Advanced Knits (3 weeks)
Gifts & Decorations (3 weeks)
Child Care (3 weeks)
Home Decorating (3 weeks)
Embroidery Stitches (3 weeks)
Consumer Buying (3 weeks)
Yeast Breads (3 weeks)
Meats (3 weeks)
Pastries (3 weeks)
Table Decorating (3 weeks)
International Foods (3 weeks)
Seafoods & Vegetable Variations (3 weeks)
Cakes, Candy, and Dessert Delights (3 weeks)
Casseroles, Salads, and Breads (3 weeks)
Menu Planning (3 weeks)
Outdoor Cooking (3 weeks)
Hand Crocheting & Knits
Sew Your Own Thing
Bathing Suits & Summer Playclothes
Pot Luck
Bachelor Specialities
Basic Bachelor Skills

TYPING

Typing
Type-Comp (also Language Arts)

MUSIC

Melody
Music Composition
Chorus I
Chorus II
Chorus III
Folk Music (also English)
Rhythm
Music of the Renaissance
Music of the Baroque
Music of the Modern Period
Music Theatre Workshop
Music of Today
Band I
Band II
Band III

MUSIC (continued)

Orchestra Ensemble
Orchestra I
Orchestra II

STUDENT AIDE PROGRAM

Office
Counseling
Nursing
Physical Education
Library
Typing
Industrial Education
Home Making
Science
Language Arts
Reading
Art
Elementary Schools (all levels)
Special Education
Audio Visual

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Soccer & Volleyball
Speedaway & Volleyball
Self-Development
Teen Age Social Problems (also Social Studies)
Adaptive P. E.
Physical Fitness
Volleyball & Touch Football
Weightlifting & Badminton
Badminton & Soccer
Swimming
Track & Field
Softball
Beginning Tennis
Intermediate Tennis
Fitness
Advanced Gymnastics
Archery
Basketball
Outdoor Education
Swifter, Higher, Farther (track)
Pigskin Peril
The Universal Sport: Soccer
Nets to You (badminton-volleyball)
You're Out
Grunts & Groans (weightlifting)
Pot Pourri

SCIENCE

Oceanography
Growth and Development
Geology
Astronomy
Microscopic Life
Botany
Zoology
Ecology
Independent Research

SCIENCE (continued)

Experimental Science
Computer Programming
Introductory Physical Science
Laboratory Skill & Concepts
Aeronautics: Science of Flight
Experimental Earth Science
Criminology

SOCIAL STUDIES

Thimk
Introduction to the Social Studies
Man: What's A Teenager?
Historical Methods
Introduction to Anthropology
Current Events I & II
Contemporary Biography
Great Personalities of the 20th Century
Teenagers and the Law
Why Do Eskimos Wear Clothes
What's A Map?
Migration
Pacific Northwest
Economics: Study of People Making Decisions
Search for an Ideal Society
Revolution
Conflict: Causes of the Civil War
Elizabethan England
Apartheid: Race Relations in South Africa
Hunger Problems in the World Today and in the Future
Live-ability
Black Studies
Literature of Religion (also Language Arts)
American Political Parties
The Aeneid
Teenage Nations
Boom and Bust
American Presidents of the 20th Century
China in the 20th Century
Classroom Discussion
Games People Play
Group Dynamics
Historical Debates
History of Germany
Inside an All-American City
Minority Groups in America
Occupational Information
Sports: History and People
Soviet Union
The Last Week: Dream or Reality
The Near or Middle East
The Odyssey
The Siege and Fall of Troy
Totalitarianism
Urban Renewal
Values
Political Satire

APPENDIX B

STUDENT OPINIONNAIRE

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Opinionnaire

Year in school 7 8 9 (circle one) Male Female (circle one)

MORE THAN ONE ANSWER MAY BE MARKED

1. How do you like being in classes with students of various age levels?

   a. Strongly like
   b. Generally like
   c. No particular feeling
   d. Generally dislike
   e. Strongly dislike

2. Have you noticed any advantages or benefits from having mixed age levels in your classes?

   a. Yes
   b. No

   What advantages or benefits, if any, have you noticed?

3. Have you noticed any disadvantages or problems from having mixed age levels in your classes?

   a. Yes
   b. No

   What disadvantages or problems, if any, have you noticed?

4. As a result of mixing age levels in classes, do you think this has had any effect on the student body as a whole?

   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Don't know

   What, if any, do you think those effects are?

5. How do you feel about your experiences in "House?"

   a. Strongly like
   b. Generally like
   c. No feeling either way
   d. Generally dislike
   e. Strongly dislike

6. Do you think having House groups is a good idea?

   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Not sure

   Please explain your opinion:

7. How do you like the idea of choosing your own courses?

   a. Strongly like
   b. Generally like
   c. Don't care either way
   d. Generally dislike
   e. Strongly dislike

   Why do you feel as you do?

8. Who made the decisions in selecting your courses this year?

   a. I alone made the decisions without suggestions from my parents
   b. My parents made suggestions, but I made most of the decisions
   c. My parents and I shared about equally in making the decisions
   d. Other (write in)_____

9. To what degree were your parents interested in the schedule you selected?

   a. Very interested
   b. Interested
   c. Slightly interested
   d. Not interested

10. What part did your advisor play in the selection of your classes?

    a. My advisor made most of the decisions for me.
    b. My advisor helped me make decisions
    c. I asked for but received little advice from my advisor
    d. I neither asked for nor received advice from my advisor

11. When my advisor and I disagreed on course selections:

    a. He tried to get me to take particular courses
    b. He recommended certain courses
    c. He contacted my parents
    d. He left the final decisions to me

12. Do you feel that the school should require you to take certain subjects or courses?

    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Not sure

    Please explain your feelings:

13. How satisfied have you been so far this year in getting the courses you wanted?

    a. Very satisfied
    b. Generally satisfied
    c. About half and half
    d. Generally dissatisfied
    e. Very dissatisfied

14. How do you like the idea of having an A and B day schedule?

    a. Strongly like
    b. Generally like
    c. No feeling either way
    d. Generally dislike
    e. Strongly dislike

15. What changes have you noticed in Roosevelt teachers?

    a. Teachers seem about the same in their approach to teaching and personality as the first time I had them
    b. Teachers seem to have a more desirable personality this year
    c. Teachers seem to have a less desirable personality this year
    d. Teachers seem to have a more interesting approach to teaching this year
    e. Teachers seem to have a less interesting approach to teaching this year
    f. No basis for answering

16. Have you observed any changes in the general atmosphere of the school this year?

    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Not sure

    What changes, if any, do you think exist?

17. How much of what you are studying in classes do you think is useful or will be useful in everyday living?

    a. Practically everything
    b. Most of it
    c. About half of it
    d. Very little
    e. None of it
    f. I'm not sure

18. How do you like changing teachers and courses every nine weeks?

    a. Like very much
    b. Generally like
    c. No feeling either way
    d. Generally dislike
    e. Dislike very much

    Why do you feel as you do?

19. How well satisfied are you with the variety

of subjects being offered?

a. Very well satisfied
b. Generally satisfied
c. About half and half
d. Generally dissatisfied
e. Very much dissatisfied

Please express what dissatisfactions, if any, you have about the courses offered. List any courses you would like to see offered.

20. Have you done more work on your own this year?

a. Yes, much more than usual
b. Somewhat more than usual
c. About the same as I always have
d. Less this year than usual

Please comment further if you wish.

21. Compare your homework with last year's:

a. More homework this year
b. More homework last year
c. About the same amount for each year

22. How have you used study lab?

a. Required homework
b. Additional work in registered courses
c. Special interest in areas not registered for
d. Games
e. Socializing
f. Other (explain)_____

23. Do you participate more in classes this year?

a. Yes
b. No
c. About the same both this year and last

Please comment if you think your participation is more this year or last year.

24. How do you like the student evaluations?

a. Strongly like
b. Generally like
c. No feeling either way
d. Generally dislike
e. Strongly dislike

25. If letter grades were given this year, do you think this would influence what courses you would register for?

a. Yes, in some cases it would be an influence
b. Perhaps in some cases it would be an influence
c. I'm not sure it would be an influence or not
d. I doubt that it would be an influence
e. It would definitely not be an influence

Please explain your reasons for your opinion.

26. Do you think you would work harder if letter grades were given?

a. Yes
b. No
c. Undecided

27. Have your ideas about letter grades changed?

a. Yes
b. No

Please explain reasons for your opinion.

28. How interested are you in shcool this year?

a. Much more interested
b. More interested
c. About the same as last year
d. Less interested
e. Much less interested

Why do you think your general interest in school is "more" or "less" than last year, if that is your feeling?

29. Please express any other opinions you have about the Roosevelt Program.

APPENDIX C

REPRESENTATIVE PUPIL EVALUATION FORMS

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL _____
Advisor

PROGRESS REPORT OF _____ _____
Student's name Teacher's name

THIMK SOCIAL STUDIES __Credit
Course Title Department __Incomplete

Thimk is a course designed to help students understand and develop thought processes.
Learning is treated as a key concept in explaining human behavior. The question--why does man behave as he does?--is our key question. Knowledge objectives similar to the following guide the study.

To know that the way the individual interprets and responds to people and things depends upon his knowledge of the world, by the way things look to him.

To know that the individual's world is selectively organized.

To know that individuals often make errors in what they attend, perceive, and report.

Etc.
To be able to interpret data received from various situations.
To be able to draw conclusions and state them effectively.
To be able to work in small groups.
To be able to distinguish facts from hypotheses.

SCHOLARSHIP: Shows an understanding of the subject matter and related skills.
Understands the course concepts_____.
Aware of current problems and events related to the subject matter_____.
Is able to read and interpret information_____.
Draws and states reasonable conclusions_____.

AGENCY: Shows a developing ability to make purposeful and responsible decisions in his educational planning.
Makes good use of time_____.
Begins work promptly_____.
Requires supervision_____.

COMMUNICATIONS: Shows a developing ability to exchange ideas and information in speaking and writing.
Communicates ideas effectively in written form_____.
Needs further course work in composition_____.
Participates actively in class discussions_____.
Speaks correctly and effectively_____.
Helps discussions move toward understandings_____.

CREATIVITY:
Shows a developing ability to think imaginatively_____.
Explores ideas_____.
Understands and expresses values_____.
Sees relationships_____.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

_____
Advisor

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

EVALUATION OF PROGRESS OF _____ 1 2 3 4
Student's name Term

_____ SHORT STORIES
Teacher's Name Course Title

_____ ENGLISH DEPARTMENT Credit given ____
Days Absent Department Credit non given ____

In this course the following short stories were read, analyzed, and discussed: "The Man Upstairs" (Ray Bradbury), "The Necklace" (Guy de Maupassant), "The Interlopers," "Gabriel-Ernest," "The Story Teller," and "The Mouse" (H.H. Munro/Saki), "War" (Luigi Pirandello), "The Catbird Seat" (James Thurber), "Moment of Truth" (Syd Hoff), "He" (Katherine Ann Porter), "A Man Who Had No Eyes" (MacKinlay Kantor), "Flight" (John Steinbeck), "The Day of the Last Rock Fight" (Joseph Whitehill), "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge" and "Middle Toe of the Right Foot" (Ambrose Bierce), "The Parsley Garden" (William Saroyan), "The Rocking-Horse Winner" (D.H. Lawrence), "As Ye Sow, So Shall Ye Reap" and "Fight Number Twenty-five" (Jesse Stuart), "The Birds" (Daphne DuMaurier), and "Charles" (Shirley Jackson).

In addition a number of short written assignments, which are named and briefly described below, were prepared by each student as partial fulfillment of the requirements for credit in this class. These

papers were generally the outgrowth of a class lecture or discussion on the elements of fiction--the short story in particular.

REQUIRED WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS
(any six out of the first seven, plus numbers eight and nine)

Kind of Assignment	Turned In Yes	Turned In No	Comments
1. Techniques of characterization			--half page example each for speech, action, reaction, externals, thoughts, and author's statement
2. Plot variations on a theme			--writing many plot lines which show the same basic theme chosen by student
3. "Daydream" paper showing the development of a main character in conflict			--students labeled papers to show various methods used to reveal character
4. "Fugitive" paper showing a main character being pursued through a variety of settings			--emphasis on development of vivid sensory images
5. A stream-of-consciousness list on the theme of war			--to help the student discover personal bias about war before reading Pirandello's short story titled "War"
6. Written structural analysis of an assigned short story			--brief analysis of character, setting, plot, point of view, and theme without assistance from teacher or classmates
7. Setting inventory from "The Birds"			--exact lines and phrases from the story to show sensory development of the setting
8. Written synopses of any twelve stories read this term.			--concise statement(s) by student which includes the essential elements of each story
9. Original short story titled "_____" Prepared with a good deal of class time and teacher assistance. Attention was also paid to possible fiction markets, and stories were to be aimed toward a particular fictitious publisher described in a writer's guide given to the students			--story was submitted to_____

Objective tests over the short stories read for this class — Raw scores given

a. Line identification ____correct out of 45 possible

b. Author identification ____correct out of 21 possible

c. Settings and stories ____correct out of 10 possible

d. Plot lines and themes ____correct out of 10 possible

Total of ____ correct out of 86 possible

Information about specific stories or assignments may be gained by talking to the student named on this report, or by calling me.

_____
(signed)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

_____
Advisor

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

EVALUATION OF PROGESS OF _____ 1 2 3 4
Student's name Term

_____ FOLK MUSIC
Teacher's Name Course Title

_____ _____ Credit given____
Days absent Department Credit not given____

In this course students became acquainted with form and style in folk music and learned a number of folk songs orally. In addition, they had an opportunity to study the "folk process" by comparing varying versions of ballads as they have changed through use and transfer,

often covering hundreds of years and thousands of miles. Attached to this sheet is a page completed by the student named above. Such a sheet is necessary since so much of the achievement in this class occurred at the personal level. To receive credit, a student needed to complete assignment #6 plus any additional five.

ASSIGNMENT	Yes	No	COMMENTS
1. Learn orally at least a dozen folk songs well enough to sing along			--refer to student's evaluation for titles of specific songs learned
2. Learn orally at least five folk songs well enough that he can pass them on orally			--more than a fragment is required; refer to student's evaluation for titles of specific songs learned
3. Play or try to play a folk instrument, preferably while the class is singing			--more than a dozen instruments were available in class, plus others brought by students
4. Read (or listen to) and analyze at least six English and Scottish traditional ballads as a form of narrative poetry			--text: Friedman's Folk Ballads of the English-Speaking World --refer to student's evaluation for titles of specific ballads studied
5. Recognize several distinguishing characteristics of the traditional ballad			--e.g., story line, stock phrases, repetition, anonymity, single situation, lack of direct moralizing
6. Collect six specimens of an oral song and hand in written transcriptions including the essential biographical data			--most students collected a taboo song about school; copies were compared in class and a composite song-text for Eugene was partially developed
7. Listen to a live folk singer who has had no academic training in folk music			--Mrs. Judkins, 88 years old, sang for the class, drawing on her repertoire of folk songs some of which she learned more than 75 years ago
8. Help compose original lyrics for a song which consciously imitates the form and style of a folk ballad			--class made up a song about the "Wild Man of Winberry Creek" --used a common Stewball tune for the melody

Music Teacher

English Teacher

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Advisor

PROGRESS REPORT OF _____ _____
Student's name Quarter

STUDENT PUBLICATIONS: YEARBOOK _____
Course Title Department

_____ ATTENDANCE
Teacher's name Periods Possible _____
Periods Absent _____

This class is responsible for preparing a yearbook for Roosevelt students. At the moment we are actually ahead of schedule. The work categories listed below indicated where the student's effort were concentrated. This term the fewest jobs were in production but next term production will dominate all other categories.

WORK CATEGORY	INDIVIDUAL STUDENT EFFORT
1. Practice exercises	
2. Sales	
3. Photography	
4. Production	

_____
Teacher's name phone

TEACHER RECOMMENDATION: Comments

____Credit

____Incomplete

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL _____ Advisor

PROGRESS REPORT OF _____ Student's name _____ Teacher's name

POLITICAL SATIRE (Course Title) | Social Studies (Department) | _____ (Quarter) | ___Credit ___Incomplete

AGENCY - A developing ability to make purposeful and responsible decisions in his/her educational planning.

Directs Activities:
Makes good use of time__begins work promptly__requires supervision__does less than required__what is necessary__more than required__seeks help when in doubt__does not ask for help__

Plans and Directions:
Listens to instructions__reads directions__takes notes__

Discussion Skills:
Participation - almost never__seldom__usually__often__
Quality - Alert__shows interest__distracts from subject__
Speaking - Weak and unsure__adjusts to class__excessive volume__expresses ideas well__at ease__confident__

MOTIVATION

Attitude toward class and personal goals:
enthusiastic__responsive__indifferent__helps others__
gives constructive criticism__accepts constructive criticism__
works beyond assignments__

CREATIVITY

Shows a developing ability to think imaginatively__explore ideas__understand values__express values__see relationships__makes use of information in current problems__ events__related to class work

BASIC SKILLS

Human: Relationship to others-
Courteous toward others - usually__often__seldom__
Disrupts class - seldom__occasionally__too often__
When corrected - rejects advice__accepts advice__ indifferent__
Shows understanding and respects contributions of others - usually__seldom__
Listens to others in class situations__responds__ interrupts__ignores__

Scholarship:
Recognizes problem__reads assigned materials__able to state problem__able to collect and sort information __arrives at sound conclusions__shows understanding of concepts involved__

Additional Comments:

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

THEODORE ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL _____ Advisor

PROGRESS REPORT OF _____ Student's name _____ Teacher's name

TEENAGERS AND THE LAW (Course Title) | Social Studies (Department) | _____ (Quarter) | ___Incomplete ___Credit

The purpose of Teenagers and the Law is to help students know how individual freedoms, rights to equal treatment and opportunity, and due process of law are protected by the Bill of Rights. Students should perceive that the rights are subject to continuous reinterpretation as conditions change, and that conflicts between rights and between individual rights and social order, often arise in the applications of the Bill of Rights to specific situations and cases. Hopefully the student will incorporate the principles involved in this study in his personal behavior and his political choices. He should also recognize his personal responsibilities to other individuals and the social order.

Demonstrates an understanding of the concept "due process of law" by stating the major procedures used to protect the rights of the accused.

Demonstrates an understanding of the Bill of Rights by being able to apply provisions of these amendments to hypothetical cases.

Demonstrates an understanding of the dynamic nature of law by examples of changes which reflect changes in society's values and beliefs.

Demonstrates an understanding of basic democratic principles; an accused is considered innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt, etc.

SCHOLARSHIP: Shows an understanding of the subject matter and related skills.
Understands the course concepts__Aware of current problems and events related to the subject matter__Is able to read and interpret information__Draws and states reasonable conclusions__

AGENCY: Shows a developing ability to make purposeful and responsible decisions in his educational planning.
Makes good use of time___Begins work promptly___Requires supervision___

COMMUNICATIONS: Shows a developing ability to exchange ideas and information in speaking and writing.
Communicates ideas effectively in written form___Needs further course work in composition___Participates actively in class discussions___ Speaks correctly and effectively___Helps discussion move toward understandings___

CREATIVITY: Shows a developing ability to think imaginatively___ Explore ideas___Understand and express values___See relationships___

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Aiken, Wilform M. The Story of the Eight-Year Study. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Bossing, Nelson L., and Roscoe V. Cramer. The Junior High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Brickell, Henry M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany, New York: State Department of Education, 1961.

Fantini, Mario D., and Gerald Weinstein. The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Goldhammer, Robert. Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Gruhn, William T., and Harl R. Douglass. The Modern Junior High School. New York: The Ronald Press Company, rev. ed., 1956.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Dell Publishers, 1969.

Kohl, Herbert R. The Open Classroom. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

Kozol, Jonathan. Death At an Early Age. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1967.

MacConnell, Charles M., Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt. New Schools For A New Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1943.

Rogers, Everett M. "What Are Innovations Like?" Change Processes In the Public Schools. Edited by Joanne M. Kitchel. University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.

VanTill, William, Gordon F. Vars, and John H. Lounsbury. Modern Education For the Junior High School Years. Indianapolis and Kansas City: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. 1967.

Other Sources

Blum, Maurice. "The Meadowbrook Program." Speech delivered at the University of North Carolina, July, 1967.

Demeter, Lee H. "Accelerating the Local Use of Improved Educational Practices in School Systems." Unpublished D.Ed. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

District 4J Board of Directors. Annual Report, 1959. Eugene: District 4J Board of Directors, 1959.

District 4J Board of Directors. Schools in Review. Eugene: District 4J Board of Directors, June, 1958.

Eugene Register-Guard. "School Beginning Unique Program," September 14, 1969.

Glasser, William. Remarks given at a meeting of the staff of Roosevelt Junior High School, Eugene, Oregon, November 9, 1970.

Jackson, Donald M. "Summaries of Student Responses to An Opinionnaire." Unpublished report to School District 4J Board of Directors, Eugene, Oregon, July, 1970.

Leep, Albert G. "Observations of The Roosevelt School Program." Unpublished report to the Board of Directors and Superintendent of Schools of District 4J, Eugene, Oregon, March, 1972.

School District 4J. "Program Outline--Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School, 1969-70." Eugene, 1969. (Mimeographed)

Theodore Roosevelt Staff. "Workshop Report." Eugene, July, 1970. (Mimeographed)

The School District of Philadelphia. "The Parkway Program." Philadelphia, May, 1959. (Mimeographed)

PRICE LIST

Back Issues, Curriculum Bulletin

	1965-66		
252.	Mankind's Many Calandars		$ .75
259.	How Do the People of Canada Work and Live?		1.30
262.	Random Excerpts on the Disadvantaged		.75
270.	Job Corps Innovations		1.30
	1967		
274.	The Oregon Six-Year Secondary School		$ .75
276.	Creativity and the Classroom		1.85
277.	The Administrator-Staff Relationship; Effect on Children		.75
279.	Guidelines to Learning: Inquiry and Discovery in the Elementary School		.80
280.	Education of Educable MR Students: Literature Review		1.25
281.	Independent Study in Secondary Schools		.85
282.	The Culturally Disadvantaged		2.00
283.	Study of Balance in Music Classes in Oregon High Schools		.50
284.	Constructing Tests in a Curriculum Study Center		.50
	1968		
285.	Study of the Academic Achievement Relative to Emotional Adjustment		$ .75
286.	Team Teaching: Definition, History, Description in Oregon		2.00
287.	How the People of the West Indies Participate in the World Community		1.35
288.	Needs of the Non-College Bound		1.20
289.	The Chewing Method in Certain Aspects of Speech Therapy		.50
290.	A Free-Association Word List for the Willamette Valley		.75
293.	Evaluation--Accreditation of Secondary Schools		.75
294.	Socialization and Acculturation of Deprived Young Children		.50
295.	Oregon's Contribution to Literature, Music and Art		.50
297.	Ingredients of Change		.50
	1969		
299.	A Program for Neglected Youth		$ .75
300.	The Teaching-Learning Environment		.75
301.	Planning for Teaching		.50
302.	Some Techniques of Teaching		.50
303.	Direct Measurement and Prosthesis of Retarded Behavior		1.50
304.	Education and Your Child		.50
305.	Evaluating and Reporting Pupil Progress		.75
306.	More Sense and Nonsense		.80
307.	Acculturation of Minority Group Children in American Schools		1.10
308.	The Clinical School Program		1.00
309.	Annotated Bibliography & Index of the Curriculum Bulletins		1.00
	1972		
310.	Remedial Reading: Case Studies		$1.50
311.	Teaching Performance: Some Bases for Change	group	1.50
312.	An Inventory of Reading Skills	rate	1.50
313.	Evaluative Reform in the Arts and Humanities	$5.00	1.50
314.	A Curriculum Manifesto (Jack Frymier)		1.50
	1973		
315.	Responding to Student Unrest: Guide for Administrators and Teachers		$2.50
316.	Annotated Bibliography of Secondary School Materials for the Remediation of Reading		2.00
317.	The Change Process: What We Can Learn From Nepal		2.00
318.	Writing Is the Funnest Thing: Teaching Creative Writing	group	1.50
319.	Emergence of an Innovative Junior High School Program	rate	1.50
320.	- - -	$5.00	- -

Directions for Ordering

Subscription Rate

U.S. and Canada . . . $5.00 Other Countries . . .$6.25 (Includes additional postage and special handling)

Back Issues are available under the following conditions:

1. PAYMENT MUST ACCOMPANY ALL ORDERS FOR LESS THAN $20.00.
2. No order for less than $1.50 can be processed.
3. If the issue you desire is out of print, a photocopy can be prepared for 10¢ per page.
4. Write for discounts on orders over $20.00.

Order from: Oregon ASCD Curriculum Bulletin
P.O.Box 421
Salem, Oregon 97308

Campus

OREGON ASCD CURRICULUM BULLETIN
P. O. BOX 421
Salem, Oregon 97308

Non-Profit Org.
Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
Paid
Salem, Ore. 97308
Permit No. 226

CLARICE KAISER
ERIC CLEARING HOUSE
UNIV OF OREGON
EUGENE OR 97403

Statements and points of view appearing in the Oregon ASCD Curriculum Bulletin do not necessarily represent the position of the editing committee or Oregon ASCD, collectively or individually. Manuscripts are presented primarily from the viewpoint of potential interest and provocativeness.

Manuscripts solicited: should treat a single topic, as a monograph or symposium, within the broad area of curriculum, 10,000 to 25,000 words in length. Submit to Oregon ASCD Manuscript Editor, P.O.Box 421, Salem, Oregon 97308.

The Library of Congress
Catalog Card No.
66-64621